

### REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the very thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 38-42, 45, 46, 49-52, 54-68, 80 and 90-100 remain in the application and claims 38, 39, 42, 50, 80, 90, 91 and 99 are independent. The Office Action dated December 6, 2010 has been received and carefully reviewed. Each issue raised in the Office Action is addressed herein. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the following amendment and remarks, inasmuch as they adopt the Examiner's helpful suggestion and are believed to automatically place the application in condition for allowance.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 80-83 and 91-100 are allowed. Applicant again appreciates this continued indication of allowability. Applicant further notes with appreciation the indication in the sentence bridging pages 7 and 8 of the Office Action that "[I]language claiming that the bottom surface of the display unit and the fitting part are both supported on the same plane would overcome the rejection." Thus, responsive to this indication, each of independent claims 38, 39 and 50 have been amended to make such support clear, and now should automatically be allowable. Should any further issues remain as to these claims, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

#### Claim Rejections – based on Jeong

Claims 38, 43, 45 and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Jeong in view of official notice. Claims 39-41, 50, 51, 53, 54, 56, 58, 59, 61-64, 66, 90 and 96-98 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Jeong in view of Helgeland. [Note that there is a minor error in the claim listing of rejected claims, wherein dependent claims 96-98 stand rejected on prior art on page 4 of the Office Action. This appears to be an error in claim listing by the Examiner as independent claim 91, on which these claims depend, has been indicated to be allowable on the PTOL-326 cover sheet at item #5 (and not in item #6) and has been indicated as allowable on page 7 of the Office Action.] Claims 44 and 48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Jeong in view of official notice. Claims 60 and 67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Jeong in view of Helgeland and

official notice.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicant respectfully submit that claims 43, 44, 47, 48, 53 and 81-83 have been cancelled, thus rendering any rejection on prior art moot. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of such rejections are respectfully requested.

Applicant submits the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness and respectfully traverses the remaining rejections. A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the cited references must teach or suggest each and every element in the claims. See MPEP § 706.02(j) and MPEP §§ 2141-2144.

With regard to the rejection of independent claims 38, 39 and 50, while not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 38, 39 and 50 have been amended to include the limitation that the display unit is separated for support of the display unit on both of a bottom surface of the display unit and a distal end of the fitting part on the same flat plane, as indicated in the sentence bridging pages 7 and 8 of the Office Action, thereby automatically placing independent claims 38, 39 and 50 into condition for allowance, along with dependent claims 40, 41, 45, 46, 49, 51, 52, and 54-68. Note that independent claims 40 and 41 have now been made dependent upon claims 38 and 39. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

With respect to claim 90, the Examiner admits on page 4 of the Office Action that Jeong does not disclose a removal prevention releasing device and relies upon Helgeland in an attempt to make up for this deficiency. That is, the rejection identifies "hand wheel 5" of Helgeland as the claimed removal prevention releasing device.

However, claim 90 now requires a removal prevention releasing device in a display unit detaching method such that:

(a) "the prevention of removal of the fitting part is canceled by an operation to an actuator"  
and

(b) "applying a force by the operation to the vertical downward direction on the actuator in the same direction as the fitting part is inserted into the stand/pillar structure, so as to detach the fitting part of the display unit ...".

Thus, the detaching method of claim 90 requires pulling up on the grip handle at the same time as applying a force by the operation to the vertical downward direction on the actuator in the same direction as the fitting part is inserted.

On the other hand, as to the identified "hand wheel 5", Helgeland discloses "[i]n operation, when the hand wheel 5 is rotated, the gears 17, 18 and 19 are rotated, and the column 9 and the support prt[sic] 6 are raised and lowered by virtue of cooperation between the thread part 16 and helical gear 17" (column 3, lines 8-13).

That is, in claim 90, the operation to the vertical downward direction is applied to the actuator, while to the contrary, in Helgeland, the operation in a rotational direction is applied to the hand wheel 5. Therefore, with respect to the operational direction, the hand wheel 5 of Helgeland fails to show or suggest an actuator wherein the prevention of removal of the fitting part is canceled by an operation to an actuator, and wherein pulling up the grip handle so as to cause a force to act in the vertical upward direction in which the fitting part is separated from the stand/pillar structure, and at the same time applying a force by the operation to the vertical downward direction on the actuator in the same direction as the fitting part is inserted into the stand/pillar structure, so as to detach the fitting part of the display unit from the stand/pillar structure, and applying a force to the fitting part to adjust the angle of the fitting part with respect to the display unit to provide stable support when separated. Therefore, Helgeland cannot remedy the admitted defects of Jeong. Reconsideration and allowance of this claim are respectfully requested.

### Conclusion

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been properly traversed and addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Notice of same is earnestly solicited.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Paul T. Sewell, Registration No. 61,784, at (703) 205-8000, in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: March 30, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael R. Cammarata  
Registration No.: 39,491  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
703-205-8000